

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 20-35 are pending in the application, with Claims 20, 24, 27, 30 and 33 being the independent claims.

The Examiner rejected Claims 20-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Inter-BS communication for IEEE 802.16e Handoff,” 2003-05-14 to *Koo et al.* (hereinafter, *Koo*).

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of the claims, the Examiner contends that *Koo* teaches, suggests, or renders obvious each and every element of the claims.

Claim 20 has been amended to more clearly recite the subject matter of the present invention. Specifically, amended Claim 20 recites a method of performing a handover on a subscriber station in a target base station. A ranging request message including a base station identifier of a previous serving base station is received from the subscriber station when a drop situation is detected by the subscriber station. Information of the subscriber station is acquired through the base station identifier of the previous serving base station. A response message on the ranging request message is transmitted to the subscriber station. Network re-entry is performed on the subscriber station.

Koo describes an I-am-host-of message that is sent by a base station to notify other base stations that a certain subscriber station is registered with it. *Koo* also describes an MSS-info-request message that may be sent from one base station to another to request information about a subscriber station. Further, *Koo* illustrates a hand-over procedure in which a serving base station sends a HO-notification to a target base station, the subscriber station sends a ranging request to the target base station, and the target base station sends a ranging response to the subscriber station.

Koo fails to provide any disclosure indicating that the ranging request message from the subscriber station includes a base station identifier of a previous serving base station, as recited

in Claim 20. The Examiner contends that it is obvious for this base station identifier to be included in the ranging request message, because the target base station would need the identifier to acquire information it received during the HO-notification message. Applicants assert that the teachings of *Koo* clearly illustrate that the identifier would not be required. For example, an identifier of a previous base station may be determined using a subscriber station identifier and a previously received I-am-host-of message in which the previous base station may be associated with the subscriber station. Further, an identifier of the previous base station may be determined using the subscriber station identifier and the HO-notification message, which would include information on both the previous base station and the subscriber station. Thus, Applicants assert that the subject matter of *Koo* actually teaches away from the inclusion of a previous BS identifier in the ranging request message.

The present invention allows for network re-entry without any prior HO-notification message or I-am-host-of message by including the identifier of the previous BS in the ranging request message, which is sent from the subscriber station to the target BS. This type of network re-entry is applicable when a service is dropped. Accordingly, *Koo* fails to teach, suggest or render obvious the reception of a ranging request message, which includes a base station identifier of a previous serving base station, at a target base station from a subscriber station when a drop situation is detected by the subscriber station, as recited in Claim 20. Accordingly, Claim 20 is patentable over *Koo*.

The Examiner also rejected independent Claims 24, 27, 30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 24, 27, 30 and 33 recite subject matter similar to that of Claim 20. In view of the above, Claims 24, 27, 30 and 33 are also patentable over *Koo*.

Regarding Claims 21-23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34 and 35, while not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, Claims 21-23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34 and 35 are also patentable for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claims 20-35 are allowable over *Koo*, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 20-35 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Registration No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.
290 Broadhollow Rd., Ste. 210 E
Melville, New York 11747
(516) 228-3565